

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action & Formalities

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 1-4, 6, and 7, amending claims 5 and 8-14, and adding new claims 15 and 16. No new matter is added.

Submitted herewith is a Petition for Extension of Time with fee.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document was received.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on forms PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 26, 2003 and December 3, 2003.

The prior art rejections are summarized as follows:

1. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibata (USP 6,159,072).

3. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata (USP 6,159,072) in view of Gottschald (USP 5,454,194).

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 1-11 In View Of Shibata (USP 6,159,072).

In rejecting claims 1-11 in view of Shibata (USP 6,159,072), the grounds of rejection state:

Shibata teaches a lens stocking device comprising a first stage 502 and a second stage, 503 each being capable of stacking a plurality of lens accommodating trays, 400 in a vertical direction and is moveable in a vertical direction, (col. 5, lines 3-6), a tray transferring unit, 300, which transfers one of the plurality of trays from a first stage, which accommodates a lens to be processes, and second stage which accommodates processed lenses, (col. 5, lines 1-3). Shibata also teaches the stocking device comprising a reader unit, which reads an identifier provided on the trays, (col. 4, lines 7-11), a control unit which sends processing data based on the read identifier to the lens processing and the lens conveying device, (col. 5, line 42-col. 6, line 19), a pair of left and right lenses being in the trays, (col. 4, line 6), a lens conveying, 300, device being provided with a movement path between the lens stocking and lens processing devices, (fig. 3), and which conveys the lenses between the stocking and the processing device, and that takes out the lens to be processed from the tray and conveys and sets the lens to the processing device and takes out the lens that has been processes and puts it back in the same tray, (col. 6, lines 36-43), and a plurality of lens stocking devices, (fig. 5, 502, 503), and lens processing devices, (fig. 4), being arranged side by side.

Office Action at pages 2-3.

With the arrangement of claim 5 of the invention, the size of a whole lens processing system can be made small (providing space savings), and the efficiency of processing can be enhanced as compared with the systems disclosed in Shibata, as well as Gottschald applied in the Section 103 rejection.

Shibata discloses a lens transport apparatus. However, Shibata clearly does not disclose a lens processing device that processes the lens and is disposed at an upper side of the tray stocking device, and a lens conveying device that is disposed between the tray stocking device and the lens processing device, includes an arm unit for holding the lens, conveys the lens to be processed from the very top tray stacked on the first stage and located at a conveying position to

the lens processing device so as to process the lens and conveys the processed lens from the lens processing device to the tray.

Gottschald discloses a system for grinding the edges of eyeglass lenses. The system is provided with a storage container 14, a sensor 11, a focimeter 12, a blocking unit 13 and three lens edger units 10 which are arranged on a circumference whose center is a manipulator 7 with an arm 8 and a sensor 9. However, Gottschald fails to disclose a concrete structure of the storage container 14. Gottschald discloses in column 6, lines 15-18 "After the completion of the grinding process the completed eyeglass lens can be removed from the eyeglass lens edger unit 10 either by hand or by the manipulator 7 and mounted in the appropriate eyeglass frame" and it is otherwise silent about how the storage container 14 functions.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, the Examiner is kindly requested reconsider and withdraw the prior art rejection in view of Shibata.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 12-14 Over Shibata (USP 6,159,072) In View Of Gottschald (USP 5,454,194).

In rejecting claims 12-14 over Shibata (USP 6,159,072) in view of Gottschald (USP 5,454,194), the grounds of rejection state:

Shibata teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a blocking device disposed in the vicinity of the lens conveying device, for attaching a cup to the surface of the lens, a base on which the lens stocking device, processing and conveying devices are disposed and casters being attached to the base. Gottschald teaches a blocking device, 13, disposed in the vicinity of the processing device, (fig. 1), for attaching a cup to the surface of the lens. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide the system of Shibata with a blocking device disposed in the vicinity of the

conveying device, as taught by Gottschald, in order to enhance the transportation of the lens. It would have been further obvious to provide the system of Shibata with a base on which the stocking, processing and conveying devices are disposed, and to attach casters to the base, since it is a old and well fact for polishing and manufacturing systems to be provided on a base, and on casters in order to make the system portable.

Office Action at page 3.

Without agreeing to or substantively commenting on the grounds of rejection of claims 12-14, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

New Claims

For additional claim coverage merited by the scope of the invention, Applicant is adding new claims 15 and 16. Claim 15 is believed to be allowable at least by reason of its dependency. Claim 16 is believed to be allowable because the applied art does not teach or suggest the recited lens stocking device and lens conveying device.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/606,316

Attorney Docket No.: Q76300

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Raja Saliba
Registration No. 43,078

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2005